

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 have been rejected. The claims have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. In Claims 1-39 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell et al., (US Patent 5,675,784), and further in view of Blinn et al. (US Patent No. 5,999,914). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the claims of the present invention are non-obvious and patentable over the claims of the cited patents, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The presently claimed invention enables product data to be stored and ultimately transmitted for use in catalogs. Stated another way, the presently claimed invention may be used to compose a catalog (e.g., by a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor receiving requested product data). Neither of the cited references, separately or in combination, discloses the claimed invention.

Neither Maxwell et al. ("Maxwell") nor Blinn et al. ("Blinn") disclose or suggest the invention of the pending claims. For instance, with respect to claim 1, as amended, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests "a method of distributing data for use in a catalog". In addition, neither of the cited reference discloses or suggests storing product data including both a manufacturer SKU that identifies the product and a customer SKU that identifies the product. Specifically, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests "storing the product data, the product data including both a manufacturer SKU that identifies each of the products and at least one a-customer SKU that identifies each of the products for one or more customers requesting that the specified product data be distributed to the customers for use in a catalog, the each customer SKU being associated with a customer for which the product data is being stored for subsequent distribution to the customer, wherein the stored product data is suitable for use by the customers ~~customer~~ in an electronic catalog, each of the ~~customer~~ customers being a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of the products."

In the most recent Examiner's response, the Examiner asserts that "Referring to 14D, step 831, Maxwell does teach the step of storing both manufacturer and

customer SKU. The Examiner cites col. 8, lines 42-67 and FIG. 14 of Maxwell. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Maxwell fails to disclose both a manufacturer SKU and a customer SKU for each of the products. In fact, only a single product_sid – “a unique identifier for a product” is disclosed in Maxwell. See col. 8, lines 42-67.

The Examiner asserts that the ““bundle-product” includes both a manufacture and customer SKU (i.e., “product-SID” and “creator-USER-SID” are stored in the same storage. Column 9, lines 43-50, Maxwell discloses the method of storing the product ID associated with the user.” Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. In fact, the “creator-USER-SID” is an “ID of the user who first added the associated record to the system.” See col. 8, lines 64-65. In other words, the creator-USER-ID identifies a user, not a product. In addition, the purpose of identification of the user who added a record to the system is clearly for debugging and security purposes to ensure integrity of the underlying system. In no manner is the “creator-USER-SID” used to identify an SKU that identifies a product or, more specifically, a customer SKU that identifies the product, where the customer SKU is associated with a customer for which the product data is being stored for subsequent distribution to the customer, as recited in claims 1, 22, 23, and 24. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. Moreover, since the product-SID is the only identifier used to identify a product, Maxwell teaches that a single identifier is sufficient to identify a product. Accordingly, Maxwell teaches away from storing two separate SKUs for a single product.

In addition, neither Maxwell nor Blinn, separately or in combination, discloses or suggests storing product data for customers requesting that the product data be distributed to the customers. In other words, neither of the cited references discloses a system designed to store product data for distribution to customers (e.g., manufacturer, retailer, or distributor) requesting that product data, where the product data is suitable for use in an electronic catalog. In other words, the present invention enables product data as an end product to be distributed to a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of each product for which data is requested, rather than accessed by a user to enable an order to be submitted, as supported by the cited references. Thus, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests storing product data for subsequent distribution to a customer associated with the customer SKU, where the customer is a

manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of the products. In fact, Maxwell teaches providing data to an end user, rather than providing data to a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor for use in a catalog. See Abstract. As such, both Maxwell and Blinn teach away from the claimed invention.

In addition, the combination of the cited references would fail to operate as claimed. In other words, the combination would fail to achieve the desired result, which is to enable the generation of a catalog with the stored product data through the use of a customer SKU and a manufacturer SKU for each of the products. Stated another way, it would be impossible to map manufacturer SKUs to customer SKUs associated with a particular manufacturer, retailer, or distributor with only a single SKU. As a result, data could not be easily customized for use by different customers in a catalog using their customer SKUs. In fact, if a customer were to receive data including a single SKU for each product (e.g., manufacturer SKU), these SKUs would most likely be meaningless to the customer receiving the data, and the customer (e.g., manufacturer, retailer, or distributor) would be unable to easily correlate these third party's SKUs to its own SKUs. In addition, it would be impossible to identify the customer(s) who are to receive data for each of the products (and the customers' SKUs), since data for some products may be requested by multiple customers, each of whom may maintain their own SKUs. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

In the recent Examiner response, the Examiner asserts that "Applicant argues Maxwell does not teach the step of "data entry template including a listing of potential values." The Examiner further cites FIG. 13, steps 163 and 146, as well as col. 6, lines 27-58. It appears that the Examiner is referring to another related application, since the claims in the above-referenced application do not include this claim language.

With respect to claim 2, as amended, neither Maxwell nor Blinn discloses or suggests "A method of maintaining catalog data stored in a system product data file" including "receiving a customer product portfolio file, the customer product portfolio file including at least one SKU associated with each product for which data is requested by a customer for use in a catalog, the customer being a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of each product for which data is requested by the customer in the customer product portfolio file." In fact, the cited references merely disclose enabling data to be accessed by a user to enable the user to order products. In no

manner do the cited references, separately or in combination, disclose or suggest providing data for use in a catalog to a customer according to a customer product portfolio file. Moreover, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests mapping the customer product portfolio file to the system product data file such that each product identified in the customer product portfolio file for which data is not in the system product data file is identified, thereby indicating whether data for each of the products for which data is requested by the customer has been obtained and stored in the system product data file. In addition, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests capturing data for one or more products identified in the customer product portfolio file that is not in the system product data file, or adding the captured data for the products to the system product data file. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is allowable over the cited art.

With regard to claim 13, as amended, neither Maxwell nor Blinn discloses or suggests “receiving a customer product portfolio file that identifies products for which data is requested, wherein the customer product portfolio file includes at least one SKU associated with each of the products for which data is requested by a customer for use in a catalog, the customer being a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of the products for which data is requested by the customer in the customer product portfolio file.” Moreover, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests mapping the customer product portfolio file to the system product data file such that each product for which data is in the system product data file is identified. In addition, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests generating enriched product data from the system product data file according to a customer profile, the customer profile indicating data associated with the products for which values are to be transmitted to the customer, or transmitting the enriched product data to the customer transmitting the enriched product data to the customer, wherein the enriched product data is suitable for use by the customer in an electronic catalog. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 21, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither of the cited references, separately or in combination, discloses or suggests “receiving a customer product portfolio file that identifies products for which data is

requested by one or more customers, the data being suitable for use in an electronic catalog, the customer product portfolio file including a manufacturer SKU associated with each of the products for which data is requested for use in a catalog, a customer SKU associated with each of the products that corresponds to one of the customers, and a manufacturer identifier identifying a manufacturer of each of the products for which data is requested, each of the customers being a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of each product for which data is requested by the customer in the customer product portfolio file” or “mapping the customer product portfolio file to the system product data file such that each product for which data is not in the system product data file is identified, thereby identifying one or more of the products for which data is requested and has not been obtained and stored in the system product data file.” In fact, in no manner do the references, separately or in combination, disclose or suggest receiving a request for product data for use in a catalog or determining whether the requested data has been obtained, as claimed. In other words, the present invention enables product data as an end product to be distributed to a manufacturer, retailer, or distributor of each product for which data is requested, rather than accessed by a user to enable an order to be submitted, as supported by the cited references. As such, the cited references teach away from the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is allowable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 26, Maxwell fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Maxwell fails to disclose or suggest accepting a selection of at least one of the set of attributes corresponding to one of the plurality of categories. The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 59-63. However, Maxwell merely discloses searching for a domain or component, not for an attribute associated with such a component. In other words, Maxwell does not enable a search for attributes such as “speed” or “size” to be performed. As a result, Maxwell fails to disclose or suggest obtaining one or more attribute values corresponding to the selected attributes for each of the selected products from the catalog database, or displaying the obtained attribute values for the selected products. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 is allowable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 28, neither Maxwell nor Blinn suggests or discloses a method of querying a catalog database that includes product data for one or more

products classified according to a data model, and extracting information that is specified by a catalog component definition from the catalog database together with the data model. Specifically, Maxwell fails to disclose accepting a user query specifying a product and a catalog component to be retrieved for use in a catalog, the catalog component including at least one of a product description, technical specifications, a marketing description, an image, and a URL associated with the product, obtaining a catalog component definition associated with the catalog component, the catalog component definition defining a format for the catalog component. Specifically, Maxwell fails to define a catalog component definition defining a format for the catalog component for use in a catalog. Moreover, Maxwell fails to disclose extracting information specified by the catalog component definition from the catalog database and the data model, or building a catalog component descriptor from the extracted information and the catalog component definition. Specifically, Maxwell fails to disclose a separate data model and catalog database from which information is extracted for building a catalog component. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is allowable over the cited art.

Blinn fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference. In fact, Blinn relates to items that have been ordered, rather than merely storing catalog data independent of orders that may processed from a catalog that is composed from stored catalog data such as that claimed. Blinn may only be used to identify products that have been ordered from a catalog. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references fails to achieve the desired result.

The dependent claims recite additional limitations and therefore also patentable over the cited references. The additional limitations are not further discussed, as the above limitations are sufficient to define over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims under USC 103 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully maintain that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this Application from the Examiner. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Elise R. Heilbrunn', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Telephone: (510) 843-6200